



SECOND LETTER

TO THE

REV. WILLIAM PALMER, M.A.,

OF

WORCESTER COLLEGE, OXFORD.

DEMONSTRATIVELY PROVING THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND
TO BE AN HERETICAL AND SCHISMATICAL CHURCH,
THE MERE CREATURE OF HUMAN INVENTION.

BY VERAX,

A CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

LONDON:

T. JONES, 63, PATERNOSTER ROW.

DOLMAN, NEW BOND STREET; J. BROWN, (LATE KEATING AND BROWN,) DUKE-STREET,
MANCHESTER-SQUARE; ANDREWS, DUKE-STREET, LITTLE-BRITAIN; LITTLE,
HENRIETTA-STREET, COVENT-GARDEN; LYNCH, MANCHESTER;
STONE, BIRMINGHAM; AND BOOKER AND CO., LIVERPOOL.

1841.

W. Davy, Printer, Gilbert-street, Oxford-street.

TO THE
REV. WILLIAM PALMER, M.A.,
OF OXFORD.

REV. SIR,

I appeal to all historical evidence, Inspired, Ecclesiastical, and Prophane, whether it were ever known, from the beginning of the world to the time of the Reformation, that Almighty God made use of wicked Men as his chosen and immediate instruments for the propagating the honor and glory of his name, for the Establishing his Church, or for the promulgation of Truth and the abolition of error; and I appeal to the judgment of all mankind whether such a conduct seems suitable to our notion of an omnipotent, omniscient and benign Providence. The Psalmist says, that Almighty God is pleased sometimes to receive his praises from the mouths of Infants and suckling babes. (Ps. viii. 3.) The Apostle also observes that he has, on occasions chosen the foolish of the World to confound the wise, and the weak to defeat the strong. (1 Cor. i. 27.) But it is no where found in the Sacred volume that Almighty God ever made choice of the impious as proper instruments to bring about such extraordinary events, or to co-operate with him in his works of grace, and therefore, Rev. Sir, If no instance can be produced till the Epoch of your pretended Reformation, of Almighty God Acting in this manner; and, if it be consistent with our ideas of his infinite wisdom and goodness, why shall we presume to think that he then, and only then, began to alter his conduct, and the usual course of his divine providence, in choosing, for the Reformation of Religion and the abolishing of error, men of abandoned consciences—without virtue, without honor, without principles, convicted of the most abominable vices, without sanctity of life and manners, to gain credit to their enterprise? No, Rev. Sir, it is not credible, we must renounce our Faith, our Reason and Common Sense, to give in to such an extravagant paradox;

and this reflection alone might be sufficient, to every man of a serious understanding and unprejudiced judgment, to sink the reputation of a Religion so inauspiciously founded, carried on upon the most corrupt motives, and concluded in the subversion of the true Faith, of pure Christian virtue, and Evangelical morality. I think it right to say so much previous to my commencing to prove, that the Church of England is an Heretical and a Schismatical Church, nothing more or less than a mere creature of Human invention. Protestants as well as Catholics agree, that neither Schismatics nor Heretics are members of the Catholic Church, nor in any way within its Pale; there only remains then to examine, who those are on whom these marks of Schism and Heresy are justly chargeable; and who, on the other hand, are free from that charge; which, if plainly made out, it will be easy to see what congregation of Faithful can be justly called the Catholic Church. As for the Greek Church, it is notoriously known, that the chief reason of their separating from the Catholic Church, (that is, the Church in communion with the See of Rome), was, because this Church asserted the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son, which yet Protestants hold to be orthodox Doctrine; and it is no less evident, that the Greek Church did Recant their error concerning this Point, and all other things wherein they differed from the Catholic and Apostolic Church, many times, but more especially in Three General Councils: 1st, In the Council of Lateran, where the Patriarch of Constantinople assisted in Person. 2nd. In the Council of Lyons, where the Greek Emperor, and other Representatives of the Greek Church were present; and lastly, in the Council of Florence, where the Emperor, the Patriarch of Constantinople, and a great many Greek Bishops were also present, and disputed the Point for a long time; which at last came to this conclusion. There were Letters of Union drawn up, wherein the Greeks did acknowledge the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and Son, the Pope's Supremacy, and some other Points of no great weight. These Letters were signed by the Emperor, and by all the Greek Bishops, (the Bishop of Ephesus only excepted), and remain upon Record to this day. Whence it is manifest, that by their own Act and Deed, they are convicted of Schism, for their wilful and causeless separation afterwards from the Catholic and Apostolic Church, the Ground and Pillar of Truth; and pray recollect, Rev. Sir, by this Authentic Instrument they

owned the Church in communion with the Church of Rome, to be the Catholic Church, and they themselves to be members of it.

As to the Nestorians and Eutychians, under this appellation I comprehend the Jacobites, Cophites, Armenians, and all other Sects who follow the opinions of Nestorius and Eutyches, touching the Person and Natures in Christ; all the rest of the Eastern Christians either adhering to the Catholic Church or to the Greek Church. What I have to say in regard to these Sects shall be dispatched in a very few words. All the learned men of the Church of England receive the Depositions of the first Four General Councils, whereof the two last excommunicated and condemned as Heretics, the Authors of these Sects and their Adherents: Nestorius, for asserting Two persons; Eutyches, for denying Two Natures in Christ; consequently, all these Sects who took up their opinions, are justly excluded from the number of True Catholics. As to the Points in dispute between the Catholic Church and Protestants, viz., Transubstantiation, the Sacrifice of the Mass, Prayers for the Dead, Invocation of Saints, &c. &c. they are as firmly believed by these Sects as by the Catholic and Apostolic Church.

I have refrained from mentioning the Waldenses, Socinians, Hussites, Lutherans, Calvinists, and all those, almost innumerable Sects continually shooting out of the Trunk of the Reformation, and spreading far and near over our bewildered Islands; such as the Anabaptists, Independents, Quakers, Mugoltonians, Seekers, Familists, Philadelphians, &c., because all these are destitute of even the least Pretence to the Name of the Catholic Church; having neither lawful Pastors, lawful Mission, nor right Ordination, and, as the Church of England grants, cannot be given without Imposition of Hands performed by Bishops. And Bishops, all these Sects ingeniously own, they have not, and consequently have no pretensions to be considered as forming any part of the Catholic Church. In regard to the main Points in controversy between Protestants and the Catholic Church; what the Greek Church holds and professes, let us learn from the pen of an ingenious Protestant Gentleman, Sir Edwin Sandy's, in his *Europæ Speculum*, p. 233. "With Rome," says he, "they concur in the opinion of Transubstantiation, and generally in the Sacrifice and whole body of the Mass; in praying to Saints; in Auricular Confession; in offering of Sacrifice and Prayer for the

Dead; and in these, without any or no material difference. They hold Purgatory also, and the Worshipping of Pictures." Thus far Sandy's. So that, though the Greek Church were a True Church it would but very little assist the Protestant cause, nay rather, it would very much prejudice it, since the Greeks hold these points to be orthodox; on the pretended falsity whereof, Protestants ground their separation.

Now touching the Church of England, this is of so great an Importance to my present purpose, or rather the only necessary point to be rightly understood, that it is requisite it should be handled with all the clearness and perspicuity imaginable; and if it be possible to make it Evident, that this Church is branded with Heresy and Schism, (two things sufficient to Unchurch any Society of Christians whatsoever), I hope I may, without vanity, say, that I have gained my Point. To Prove then that the Church of England is both Heretical and Schismatical (I really am sincerely concerned to use such harsh expressions to so many ingenious and Great Men, whose learning and other good qualities I greatly admire and respect) I shall make use of no Arguments but such as are grounded upon the clear Light of natural Reason, upon the consent of mankind, and the concession of our Adversaries; and upon such known and evident matters of Fact, as the most Impudent Wrangler would be ashamed to deny. As to the first; that the Church of England is Heretical, I prove it thus: whatsoever Society of Christians obstinately denies any Doctrine believed by the Catholic Church to be of Faith, is Heretical; but the Church of England denies obstinately some Doctrines believed by the Catholic Church to be of Faith, therefore the Church of England is Heretical. The Major, or First Proposition is a known Principle, which no Christian in his senses ever denied; the Minor, or Second Proposition, I demonstrate thus: the Church of England obstinately denies Transubstantiation, the Sacrifice of the Mass, and many other Points; but these are believed by the Catholic Church to be of Faith; therefore the Church of England denies obstinately some Doctrines believed by the Catholic Church to be of Faith. That the Church of England denies obstinately the said Doctrines or Points is a matter of Fact, and what she prides herself very much in; that the same Points or Doctrines were all, in the beginning of the Reformation, believed by the Catholic Church to be of Faith; we have, besides the unanimous consent of the

Catholic Church, of the Greek Church, and of all the Eastern Churches, the Testimony of several most Learned Protestants, who surely would never have told a thing so favourable to their Adversaries, if it had not been manifestly True. And to prove the truth of what I assert, I will give some quotations from them.

Hospinian says, "Luther's separation was from all the world." (*Epist.* 141.) "Popery was a leprosy," says Dr. White, (*Defence*, c. 37, p. 136), "breeding so universally in the Church, that there was no visible company of Men appearing in the World free from it." Bishop Jewel says, (*Sermon on St. Luke ii.*), "The whole World, Princes, Priests, and People, were overwhelmed with Ignorance, and bound by oath to the Pope." Dr. Whitaker says, (*Controv.* 4, 9, 5, c. 3), "In times past no Religion but the Papistical had place in the Church." Bucer says, "All the World erred in that Article of the Real Presence." (p. 660.) Calvin says, (*Justit.* 4, c. 18), "They made all the Kings and People of the Earth Drunk, from the First to the Last." Perkins says, (*Eposit. Symb.* p. 266), "During the space of 900 years the Popish Heresy had spread itself over the world." Luther says, (*Tom.* 7, p. 481), "Your Popish Religion is diametrically opposed to the Protestant." The same says Chillingworth, (c. 5, p. 312.) Perkins, in the Dedication of his *Reformed Catholic*, says, "It is the Policy of the Devil to think that the Protestant and the Popish Religions are one in substance." Then what becomes of poor Sweet, mild Dr. Bunney, and even of your Mitred Martyr, Laud, who both affirm, that Catholics and Protestants have in reality but the same Religion; were they both victims to the Policy of Satan? Field says, (*Appendix*, P. 3, p. 18), "The present Roman Church is an heretical Church, with which we cannot communicate." Nay says he, "She is an Heretical and Apostolical Church; the Synagogue of Satan, the faction of Anti-Christ! out of which we must fly!" (p. 47.) Now, had he but had the kindness to have told us when, and from what prior Church she did Apostatize, he would have deserved our best thanks; and permit me to tell Protestants, that as they can do neither the one nor the other, they will be for ever fairly beaten out of the Field of Controversy. This cloud of Witnesses, which in fact is not one twentieth part of what may be brought forward from the writings of the most learned men of your Pretended Reformation, amounts to this: that before the Reformation there was no other Reli-

gion in the Whole Christian World, but the Catholic, or as some Vulgar Bigotted Protestants are pleased to call it, the Papistical; and that the aforesaid Points, and many more, which they call Popery, Leprosy, and Ignorance, were universally believed as Articles of Faith, by all the visible companies of Christians in the World. And if this be true, the Church of England which obstinately denies these Points, and many more, must necessarily deny some Doctrines believed by the Catholic Church as of Faith, and consequently the Church of England is Heretical.

In regard to the Second, viz., that the Church of England is Schismatical. This is no less evident than the former; for, if Schism be a wilful separation from the Church, as it is defined by all mankind, as well by Protestants as by Catholics, the Church of England is doubly guilty of this crime. First, for separating from the Pope, and their own immediate Heads, the Bishops of England. Secondly, for separating from the communion of all other Bishops in the World besides. The Bishop of Rome, at the commencement of your pretended Reformation, was acknowledged by all the World to be, at least, Patriarch of the West; and by the Protestants themselves, to have exercised jurisdiction over the Church of England for upwards of Nine Hundred Years, even from the time of its conversion to Christianity; and surely so long a prescription is a sufficient title, though no other could be shewn. We find in the Acts of the Third General Council held at Ephesus, that a complaint was made by the Bishop of Constantia in Cyprus, (*Binius, Tom. 2, Append. 1, cap. 4*), against the Patriarch of Antioch, who wished to force that Island to submit to his Jurisdiction, and oblige its Metropolitan to receive the Grace of Ordination from him, as the Holy Council calls it. To this complaint the Council answers: That if the Bishops of Cyprus could make out, that the Patriarch of Antioch, had never conferred orders upon the Metropolitan, it was unjust to pretend to it now. And it being fairly proved in favor of these Bishops, the Council decreed, that the Patriarch of Antioch had no Jurisdiction over them, nor ought to pretend to any. Whence it is manifest, that if the Patriarch of Antioch could prove that he had conferred orders upon their Metropolitan at any time, or exercised lawful jurisdiction over them, the Council would have Decreed that Island to be subject to him, and that as it was a manifest usurpation in the Patriarch of Antioch to pretend to any such jurisdiction, since he was not in Possession of it, nor could prove to have

ever had it, so likewise it would have been open Rebellion and Schism in them to withdraw from his jurisdiction, if he were legally possessed of it.

Now, I would wish to learn from you, Rev. Sir, if the same Council were to judge the Church of England (and this General Council, recollect, is acknowledged by the Church of England,) and the Pope's cause, what would they think of it? Pope Eleutherius sent some of his clergy to convert the Britons in the reign of King Lucius. St. Gregory sent Augustine the Monk, and others, to convert the Saxons, and exercised jurisdiction over them, ordaining their Metropolitan, or causing him to be ordained by his orders; and the Popes, his successors, continued in peaceable possession of this Prerogative, and they (the Clergy and People of England) receiving and obeying his lawful commands, not only as Patriarch of the West, but even as the Head of the Church, for the space of nine hundred years and upwards. What would this Council, I say, think of the Church of England rising up against the Pope's authority, after so long a prescription? Certainly it would look on them as Rebels against the best established Authority in the World. Nor will it in any way help your cause to say, as Protestants usually do, that the King of England has the Right to Transfer the Papal, or Patriarchal Power from Rome, and confer it upon the Archbishop of Canterbury; for, besides it is most absurd to suppose that a King is possessed of such a Power, since it cannot be imagined how such an Ecclesiastical Authority can be claimed by any Secular Prince, we have an express decree to the contrary in the Fourth General Council held at Calcedon (and which is also acknowledged by the Church of England)—Concil. Calced. Act 6. What gave rise to it, is as follows:—the Bishop of Tyre was anciently Metropolitan of Phœnicia, and as such, exercised Jurisdiction over all the Bishops in that Province. Marcianus the Emperor, (contrary to the Canons of the Council of Nice, by which it was provided, that there shall be but one Metropolitan in each Province,) made a Pragmatic Sanction whereby he constituted the Bishop of Berithum to be the Metropolitan in the same Province, and placed under him a great many of the former Metropolitan's Suffragans; which when the Bishop of Tyre exposed to the Council, it was unanimously decreed, that the said Bishop of Tyre should be restored to all his Privileges and Jurisdiction, notwithstanding the Emperor's sanction, which this Holy Council declared to be of no force or virtue

against the Canons of the Church. So that it is evident this General Council knew nothing of any such Ecclesiastical Power vested in the Emperor, though master of almost all the world,—much less in a Prince of only a few Provinces. I know there is a Canon of a Council held long after at Constantinople, called Quinisexta-Synodus, which provides, that if the Emperor should erect or raise any City to the dignity of Metropolis of a Province, the Ecclesiastical power ought to follow the Temporal. The sense of which Canon, I conceive, must be this,—that either the Bishop of the City thus dignified was to have the Jurisdiction of a Metropolitan over all the Bishops of the Province (the former Metropolitan being reduced to the condition of a private Bishop), or that the same Province ought to be divided into Two, and governed by Two Metropolitans with distinct Limits and Jurisdictions. Which of the two be the sense of those Fathers, it is manifest that this Canon does not exempt the one or the other from the Jurisdiction of the Patriarch, much less from that of the Pope, as Head of the Universal Church. And indeed, to give it the most rigorous interpretation, it is impossible to stretch it any further than this,—that when a City is made a Metropolis, or Head of a Kingdom, the Bishop of that City ought to have Jurisdiction over all the Bishops in the same Kingdom. But this does not give the least colour of an exemption from the Ecclesiastical power to which this Kingdom was subject before. Besides, this was not enacted by the Emperor, or by any Secular Prince; but by a Council of Bishops, in favour, doubtless, of the Episcopal dignity, because it was proper that the first Bishop or Metropolitan should have his Seat in the Metropolis of the Kingdom, and take his Title thence. And yet we see this never took place in the West; otherwise the Archbishop of Paris in France, of London in England, and others, might as justly pretend to a Primacy in these several Kingdoms; which, I am convinced, the Archbishop of Canterbury would as much oppose as any of the rest.

Now, Rev. Sir, that the Church of England did wilfully separate from the Pope,—from her own immediate Heads, the Bishops of England,—and from the Communion of all the Bishops in the World besides,—is a plain matter of fact, equally attested by all writers, as well Catholics as Protestants—such as Stow, Baker, Dr. Heilen, Dr. Burnet, &c. &c. King Henry the Eighth separated from the Pope, and assumed to himself the Title of Head of the

Church of England, persecuting and putting to death all such who opposed his supremacy. After the death of Queen Mary, in whose reign the Church of England was again reconciled to Rome, Queen Elizabeth called a Parliament in order to settle matters of Religion. In this Parliament, all the Bishops of England were deprived of their Episcopal Sees; some cast into prison, others banished the country, all violently forced away from their Flocks and Pastoral Functions. Nor will it by any means serve the Protestant cause to say (which yet is your only plea) that the Bishops were deprived because they would not take the Oath of Supremacy revived by that Parliament. For, besides it is a thing unheard of, that any Society of Laymen should take upon themselves to determine Spiritual Matters, (for such was the Tenure of that Oath,) and to impose them upon the Bishops, to whom it belonged to determine such matters; this proceeding was contrary to the ordinary methods of Parliament, both before and ever after that time; for all things relating to Ecclesiastical and Spiritual Matters are first determined and agreed upon in the Convocation of Bishops, whose province and care it is to declare what is Spiritual and what not, and then referred to both Houses of Parliament to be passed into a Law, which vested the supreme Spiritual Power in the Queen; and which all the Bishops in the Kingdom solemnly protested against, as a thing as monstrously absurd as it was before unheard of. And yet they must be all deprived of their Sees, because they would not swear to the truth of, nor consent to this Spiritual Power to be lodged in a person, whose very sex rendered her incapable of it; indeed, they might as well have deprived them of their Sees, for not believing and swearing to the Truth of the Alcoran: but this is too absurd to require a confutation

That the Church of England separated from the Communion of all other Bishops in the World is evident even to this day, since they never were able to shew as much as one single Bishop in the whole World who professes to be of their Communion. Now, if this be not Schism, I confess I know not what is. To separate from the Pope and from all in Communion with him,—to separate from their own Bishops, and raise Altars against their Altars, or rather to pull down Altars, as they have done,—to separate from all the Bishops in the World,—if this be not in the highest degree Schismatical, farewell to Reason and to Religion. And here I may justly make the same Intercession (as St.

Paul calls it,) against the Church of England, with that of Elijah against the Schismatical Church of Israel, whose perfect image (I say it with deep regret,) she bears:—"Lord, they have killed thy Bishops and Priests, and digged down thy Altars, and we poor persecuted Sheep are left alone, and they seek our lives to take them away."

As to the Catholic Church, I need not advance any more reasons than those which I have already offered, to prove that this Society of Christians is the True Catholic Church; for since it is manifestly proved that neither the Greek Church, nor the Nestorian, nor the Eutychian, nor the Church of England, is the Catholic Church,—every one of them, I know, have always pretended to retain the Hierachy of the Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and think it essential to the Being of the Catholic Church; but even that is not enough, unless they have likewise the Catholic Faith and Communion, which, together with the said Hierarchy, make up the essential parts of the Catholic Religion,—it remains, that the Church in Communion with the See of Rome, must necessarily be the True Catholic Church. However, I shall lay down some Rules, agreed on by all sides to pertain to the Catholic Church, which upon examination will be found to be peculiar to the Church in Communion with the See of Rome. First—The Church in Communion with the See of Rome is a great Body of the Faithful, spread over all the parts of the World; there being but few Kingdoms known, where some Believers in Communion with the Bishop of Rome are not to be found. Hence she justly claims the Title of Catholic. Second—If we except the Protestants, there are but few Material Points in which all other sects differ from her, and most of these are condemned by Protestants; as are most, if not all the points wherein the Protestants differ from her, condemned by all other Sects. An evident argument that she alone hath the Truth, since if these things on which they ground their separation had been evident, as they pretend, they would all agree in them. Third—All other Sects separated from the Communion of the Church in Communion with the See of Rome, beginning each Sect in one, or two in opposition to the whole World,—and we are able to point out the age and the year of their separation, and also the Name and Character of each Sect's Author and Promoter,—an argument that she is the Mother Church or Root of the Tree, and those Sects some Branches fallen or cut off. Fourth—The Church in Communion with the See of Rome was

never condemned by any General Council of Bishops, whether National or Provincial, for the points of Faith which the Protestants contest, if we except the Bishops made in England by Secular power, where the true Bishops were all discarded; but the opinions held by the Protestants, and all other Sects, in opposition to the Church in Communion with the See of Rome, were condemned by several General Councils, as every learned man can tell. Fifth—It never could be made out in what Age, or Year, or in whose Reign, or by whom any of the points in dispute were introduced into the Catholic Belief;—an evident argument that they were believed from the beginning; it being impossible to conceive how all the Christian World could be induced to believe these things, contrary to what they held before, and yet that no man should perceive it; nay, it is absurd and ridiculous to imagine, that the greatest part of mankind should not be alarmed at the novelty of a Doctrine which, if we believe the Protestants, shocks so much both Sense and Reason; whereas the new Doctrine of Arius, Nestorius, Luther, Calvin, and the rest of his Tribe, so violently shook the whole Earth, that to this very day, our own woeful experience is but too sensible a Testimony of its direful effects. Sixth—The Church in Communion with the See of Rome has the consent of all the Christian World for her Tenets in matters of Faith; if we except that of the different Sects, which sprung up at different times, which, as I have before proved, amounts to no more than the dissent or contradiction of one single man concerning one Point, in one Age, at least at different times, and that in opposition to all the rest of mankind;—a Prerogative which no other Society of Christians can pretend to; it being evident, and even confessed by themselves, that the opinions which they hold in opposition to the Catholic Church, were taken up by certain men, in different ages, and at different times;—such as by Luther in the 16th century, by Wicklief in the 13th, by De Waldo in the 12th, &c. &c. Since, therefore, the Church in Communion with the See of Rome is as universal in its Communion as almost the bounds of the Earth,—as ancient in its Doctrine as the Apostles of Christ;—since it was it alone that adhered to the ancient Faith and rejected the novelty of all Heresies, and can only glory in having the universal consent of the Christian World (See my Further Reply to Dr. Hook,) for the Truth of its Doctrine;—this Society, and no other, is the True Catholic and Apostolic Church—the

Ground and Pillar of Truth. Antiquity always looked on Heretics and Schismatics as Persons out of the Way of Salvation. St. Cyprian says, Ep. 62, (in the Oxford Edition, Ep. 4, p. 175,)—"The House of God is but One, and no one can have Salvation but in the Church;" and in his Book of the Unity of the Church, p. 109, &c. he says,—“He cannot have God for his Father, who has not the Church for his Mother. If any one could escape who was out of the Ark of Noah, then he who is out of the Church may also escape. This stain is not even washed off with a man’s blood. Such a one may be put to death for religion, but he cannot be crowned.” St. John Chrysostom says, (Hom. 1, in Pascha.)—"We know that Salvation belongs to the Church alone, and that no one can partake of Christ, nor be saved out of the Catholic Church and the Catholic Faith." St. Augustine says, (Ep. 209,)—"For though the conversation of some of them appears commendable, yet their very separation from the Church makes them bad, according to that of our Saviour, St. Luke, xi. 23,—‘He who is not with me, is against me; and he who gathers not with me, scatters.’" St. Fulgentius, in his Book of Faith, c. 37, says,—“Hold most firmly and without any doubt, that no one who is baptized out of the Catholic Church can partake of Eternal Life, if before the end of this life he be not restored to the Catholic Church and incorporated therein." And the Protestant Bishop Pearson says, (Expos of the Creed, anno 1669, p. 349,)—"The necessity of believing the Catholic Church, appeareth first in this, that Christ hath appointed it as the only way unto Eternal Life."

I cannot refrain from dwelling on a passage in your Letter to the Rt. Rev. Dr. Wiseman, as follows: "You will excuse me therefore, if I seem to question your right to the title of Bishop. What you assume, and which your adherents are willing to recognise, you at least cannot deny, that Episcopal consecrations, performed ostensibly for Churches without clergy or people, but really for the purpose of introducing or perpetuating Schism, are illegitimate, and confer no canonical mission or jurisdiction. You are aware, that such Ordinations are, according to the Canons, virtually null and void; and that they do not constitute those who receive them real Bishops—Successors to the Apostles. If therefore, as is reported, you have received the Form of Episcopal consecration at Rome, this does not prove you to be a Bishop, or excuse you for exer-

cising Episcopal and Sacerdotal functions, without the Licence, and in opposition of your Legitimate (Schismatical) Diocesan, the Bishop of Worcester; an offence which subjects you to deposition and excommunication by the Canons received by the whole Catholic Church." Here, Rev. Sir, you betray the most gross want of Theological research, a perfect ignorance of the subject on which you presume to write. For you know, or ought to know, that a Priest can receive the character of a Bishop without receiving mission and jurisdiction; a Deacon can receive the character of a Priest without receiving mission; a Commander in the Navy may receive the commission of Captain without being appointed to any ship, yet they are all entitled to the honours due to their stations, but they cannot perform the functions of their respective situations till they have received powers so to do.

The Position of the Right Rev. Dr. Wiseman is as follows. The Right Rev. Dr. Walsh, the Catholic Ordinary of the Midland District, has a numerous "Clergy and People"—Dr. Wiseman is his coadjutor Bishop, from whom he has received Mission and Jurisdiction in that District of England—if Dr. Wiseman retired to Meliopotamus he would exercise there *ordinary Jurisdiction*—so that he exercises *delegated Jurisdiction* in this part of Great Britain, and is thus to be considered in a two-fold point of view, viz., an Ordinary in his own Diocese,—a Vicar General in the Midland District. If the Catholic and Apostolic Church followed your false and untheological notions, she would act diametrically opposite to the line of conduct pursued by the Blessed Apostles; for they consecrated Bishops, sending them throughout the whole world to preach the Gospel, and surely when they commenced their Labours, and established their Sees, they had neither then "Clergy nor People," but still they were True Bishops. So here falls to the ground your famous argument. As to what you ridiculously assert in regard to the Bishop of Worcester (a Bishop, I own, he is by Act of Parliament, but in no other respect) being his Legitimate Bishop, you know, or ought to know, that the *Catholic and Apostolic Church*, "*the ground and pillar of Truth*," looks on him, and all others of that sort, as simple Lay Persons; and as a proof of the Truth of what I assert, I beg to inform you, that whenever any of your Parsons return to the bosom of the Catholic Church, they are always ordained over again—whereas there never was yet known, throughout the whole

World, one single example of a Bishop, or of a Priest, who having abandoned the Faith of the Catholic Church, and embracing any Heretical or Schismatical Communion, being required to submit to be re-ordained or consecrated again—not even by the Church established by an Act of Parliament. You cannot deny, but that in the Diocese of London there is a donation of £40. a year given to every Priest that Reads his Recantation, and without requiring him to be re-ordained, and he is empowered immediately to exercise all his Functions as a Parson. I call on you now, before the Bar of Public Opinion, to show your credentials, and to inform us whence you came? Who called you (the Parsons) to the Ministry? Who made you Pastors of Christ's Flock, Stewards, Overseers in his Family, Dispensers of his Sacraments? Where and from whom did your Bishops receive their Consecration? For it is not enough to tell us, that all Christians are exhorted in the Scripture to teach, to administer, and, if they can, to convert others who have erred from the Truth. All this may be done, and ought to be done, by any private Christian; it is a part of that Charity which we all owe to one another. But this was not the case of the First Reformers. They pretended to all the most solemn Functions of the Ministry; the Administration of the Sacraments, the Ordination of other Ministers, Preaching by Office, &c. &c. Now this is certain, that neither Scripture, nor any other authority, commissioned them so to do. Nor is there any one Text which you can bring forward in their favour, but what will full as well Justify any Man or Woman that has but a good opinion of their own Abilities, which few want, and a strong inclination, which Enthusiasts commonly have, to intrude themselves into the Ministry, and undertake to execute every branch of the Apostolic office, unsent by any one, but him who sent all False Prophets from the beginning. Unhappy those! who having forsaken the True Ministers of Christ, the Heirs and Successors of the Apostles, have been by a Strong Delusion delivered up to such Ministers, who have thrust themselves upon them as Guides to Eternity, without any thing but their own presumption to recommend them. Alas! they have forsaken the True Fountain of Life, and dug to themselves broken Cisterns, that can hold no Water.

Permit me to inform you likewise that there are but two ways by which any one may be lawfully commissioned to Preach and to teach, or entitled to any other part in the

Ministry; the one by an extraordinary Mission immediately from God, the other by being licensed by Men that have the Authority for so doing, derived by Succession from Hand to Hand, down from those who had their commissions from Christ's own mouth; and this is called Ordinary Mission. Of this kind is the Mission of all our Catholic Bishops and Pastors, descending in one and the same communion from them. But as for Luther, Calvin, Tindall, Cranmer, and all the rest of the Apostles of the Reformation, of what sort was their Mission? was it, I ask you, Extraordinary and immediately from God? or was it Ordinary, and so came to them by the Ministry of Men? If Extraordinary and immediately from God, where are their Patents from his Divine Majesty, Stamped with the Broad Seal of Heaven, that is to say, attested by evident Miracles, in Proof of their being thus extraordinarily commissioned to réform and alter the whole face of the Church? For without such Proofs as these, no Pretensions to an extraordinary Mission, in opposition to the ordinary Church Authority, established both by the Words and Miracles of Christ, can be received; otherwise every Fanatic or Enthusiast might at his pleasure pretend a call from Heaven, and upon this pretext preach up his own Dreams for the pure Word of God, in contempt of all Authority of Church or State. If their Mission were Ordinary and derived to them by the Ministry of Men, I would wish much to learn from you what Men they were? Were they Catholics, or were they Protestants? Not Protestants; because they can name no such who commissioned them to preach. Not Catholics; because the Religion which Luther and his Fellow Reformers taught, was a New Religion, point-blank opposite to that of the Catholics; and therefore could not be taught in virtue of any commission from Catholics. It is true, Rev. Sir, that Luther had received his Orders in the Catholic Church; but this could never authorize him to commence Preacher and Teacher of another Religion, no more than any office or commission given by any Prince or Commonwealth can entitle Deserters or Rebels to any Civil or Military Trust; or permit them to alter the Constitution, or to turn the Government topsy-turvy.

Could the Orders which you have received in the Church of England, warrant you to teach a Doctrine anathematized by that Church? you cannot think so. And yet Luther's case was the same. And so was that of almost all the Arch-Heretics that ever have been from the Beginning;

they had received their Orders in the Church; but, when they pretended to reform her Faith, she desired to see their Commission. For without some other Patents, the bare receiving Orders in the Church, brings with it a greater obligation of obedience to her Decrees; not any commission to question her Authority, preach down her Doctrine, or condemn her Decisions. Was it for nothing that Christ himself so often mentions his being sent by his Father? St. Matthew, x. 40; St. Luke, x. 16; St. John, v. 23, 24, 30, 36, 37; x. 36; xi. 42; xii. 49; xvii. 3, 8, 18, 25. Was it for nothing that the Apostle takes care to acquaint the Hebrews? Heb. v. 4, 5. That no man taketh this honor to himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron. So also Christ glorified not himself to be made an High Priest; but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, &c.? Was it for nothing that Christ so solemnly sent his Apostles, and their Successors, St. Matthew, xxviii. 19, 20, with a commission to Teach, or as it is in the Greek, to disciple and baptise all nations; and this after having promised, All Power is given unto me in Heaven, and in Earth, to shew the authority by which he gave them this commission; and promising in the close of the same commission, that their Succession should never fail; and behold, I am with you all Days, even till the End of the World? Was it for nothing that he said to the same Apostles, St. John, xx. 21, As my Father hath sent me, even so I send you, &c.? See also the Mission of the Seventy Disciples, St. Luke, x. 1; and calling St. Matthias to the Apostleship, Acts, i. 24, 25, 26. The Appointment of the Seven Deacons by Imposition of the Apostles Hands, Acts, vi. 3, 5, 6. The Mission of Paul and Barnabas, Acts, xiii. 2, 3, 4. The communication of this Mission to the Disciples and Successors of the Apostles by Imposition of Hands, Acts, xiv. 22, 23; 2 Tim. i. 6, ii. 2, compared with 1 Tim. v. 22, Titus, i. 5, &c. How then can some learned Protestants assert, as they constantly do, that the Mission of Bishops and Prelates is in itself a trifling circumstance, of little or of no importance, of which there is scarcely any mention in the sacred writings? The Primitive Fathers constantly appeal to the Mission and Succession of Bishops from the Apostles, as irrefragable evidence against all Heretics, as may be seen in St. Irenæus, Disciple of the Disciples of the Apostles, *Lib.* 4, c. 43. "We must obey those Priests," says he, "that are in the Church, that have the Succession from the Apostles, that together with Episcopal Power, have,

according to the good pleasure of the Father, received the certain Gift of Truth. But others who are not of the original Succession, in whatsoever Place they are assembled, to have suspected, either as Heretics and of Bad Doctrine, or as Schismatics, &c.”; with whom agrees the ancient and learned Tertullian, in his excellent Tract of Prescriptions against Heresies; where he shews, that all Heretics are convicted by this, that they cannot shew a Succession of Pastors of their Communion from the Apostles, ch. 32. “Let them produce,” says he, “the origin of their Churches; Let them give us a list of their Bishops, drawn down by Succession from the beginning, so that their first Bishop had either One of the Apostles, or an Apostolic Man, who continued always in Communion with the Apostles for his Predecessor. For in this Manner do Apostolical Churches verify their Pedigree; as the Church of Smyrna produceth Polycarp, placed there by St. John; and the Church of Rome, Clement, ordained by St. Peter; let Heretics counterfeit anything like this if they can.” Hence he infers, ch. 37, that since the case thus stands, we need not Scripture to shew, that Heretics are not to be allowed to appeal to Scripture; but that we may justly say to them, “Who are you? When and Whence did you come? What have you to do in my Estate, you that are none of Mine? I plead Possession; my Possession is of long standing; it is of older date; I am Heir of the Apostles.”

But if the Fathers appeal to Apostolical succession in general, they more frequently and more earnestly appeal to the Succession of Bishops from Peter in the See of Rome, as a most powerful argument against all Heresies, by reason of the Pre-eminence of this Apostle, to whom Christ so solemnly committed his whole flock, (St. John xxi. 15, &c.)—and also, because it was a matter of fact, notorious to the whole World, and which not one of the Heretics then called in question, that the Bishops of that Church were Peter’s Successors.—See St. Irenæus, L. 3, c. 3; St. Optatus, L. 2, *Contra Parmenianum*; St. Epiphanius, *Hæc.* 27; St. Augustin, L. *Contra Epist. Fundamenti*, c. 4; L. *de Utilitate Credendi*, c. 17; *Epist.* 165, *ad Generosum*. One of the great terms of Salvation is to hear the True Church, and her Pastors the Apostles, and their Successors (St. Matthew, xxviii. 17, 18; St. Luke, x. 16); to beware of False Prophets (St. Matthew, vii. 15); to take heed of Thieves and of Robbers, that enter not in by the Door, but climb up another way (St. John, x. 1). And how can they pretend

to the Graces annexed by the Gospel to Christ's Sacraments, who willfully separate from those to whom alone Christ has given the power to administer these Sacraments? We have Christ's infallible Word for the continuance of the Succession, even till the end of the World (St. Matthew, xxviii. 19, 20). Christians may therefore know and be assured, by Christ's own Word, that this Succession has never been interrupted. Besides, the evidence of the fact speaks for itself; since these two things are most evident: First—That the Bishops of the Church in the beginning were established by the Apostles, and the Apostles by Christ. Secondly—That the Church has never, in any age since the Apostles, admitted any for Bishops or Pastors but those that were ordained by other Bishops. Protestants, I know, frequently say, that some of the Popes having been guilty of the most execrable crimes, and therefore it is most absurd to suppose that there could be no True Ministers but such as received a sanction from them. But I ask, are they of the opinion of the Donatists, that the efficacy of the Institutions of Christ depends upon the sanctity of the Ministers? If so, who can be secure in any Communion? If not, what is it to the purpose to tell us that some Popes have been very wicked? Were the first and chief Reformers any better?

Protestants also assert, that when the Popedom was divided, and there were two or three Popes together, anathematizing and damning each other, how can we under these circumstances, they say, find out the Right One? To which I answer, that it was, generally speaking, very easy to determine who was the True Pope, when any dispute of this nature was started: but from whomsoever of them a Bishop received his Orders, there was never any doubt of the validity of the Ordination; as for the Defect of Lawful Mission, it was always supplied by the Church when the Schism was extinguished; and those who had been ordained in Schism, received a sanction from the undoubted Pope to continue in their Orders. Protestants also say, could the Popes of Rome prove their regular succession from the Apostles, yet, if they have departed from the Apostolic Faith, they are not Christian Bishops, &c.—True; and therefore, mere succession of orders, such as the Arians and other Heretics have had, is not sufficient to make any Society the True Church of Christ. So that this mark, as Bellarmine remarks, if taken barely by itself, is not sufficient to demonstrate which Society is the True

Church of Christ, though it sufficiently shews which is not the True Church of Christ,—viz., all such as have not this succession. As to the rest, I defy you or any Protestant on Earth to prove, that the Bishops of Rome have ever departed from the Apostolic Faith; and what is more, we have an evident assurance from Christ's own Words, that there should always be a succession of Pastors adhering to the Apostolic Faith (St. Matt. xxviii. 19, 20, and xvi. 18); and which you will not be able any where to find out of the Church in Communion with the See of Rome.

I shall conclude this letter, Rev. Sir, with this dilemma,—either the Church in Communion with the See of Rome was the True Church of Christ at the time when the first Preachers of Protestantism appeared upon the Stage, or not;—if she were the True Church of Christ, how can they justify their Revolt from her?—If not, what Mission or Authority can they pretend to derive from her, who by her Fall had lost all Authority herself?

And I am,

Rev. Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

VERAX,

A Catholic Layman.

P.S.—I am not surprised at Bishop Wiseman declining in future to answer your ill-concocted letters. First—his great occupations; second—your letters are in many respects, illogical and non-theological; third—they are filled with assertions, sophisms, and extracts taken from ancient Heretics, dressed up by you in order to deceive the public; therefore, I suspect, this great Prelate wisely calculates that his high reputation would gain nothing by refuting your calumnies. But on my return from the Continent, it is my intention to address a certain number of letters to you on all the leading points in controversy between Catholics and Protestants; and then let an enlightened Public judge between us. I have had no communication, I assure you, with Bishop Wiseman, on this or on any other subject, having been only once in his company in my life, and then only for a few minutes.

NOTES.

THE CHURCH IN COMMUNION WITH THE SEE OF ROME.

NOTE I.—*The Roman Catholic Church acknowledged Pure and Orthodox in all doctrinal points during the first five hundred years of the Christian æra.*

THOUGH this important point seems to be universally granted by Protestants, yet, as the old adage expresses it, in order to leave no stone unturned, I shall select four of their most learned British divines, out of many, whose words put it out of all dispute.

“During the *first five hundred years* (says Whitaker*) the *whole church* was *pure*, and *inviolably* taught the faith delivered by the apostles.” If the *whole church* were *pure*, so was the Roman; had she been tainted in any way with error, would so sagacious an adversary have passed her by without notice?

“St. Augustine and the other godly fathers (says their famous Jewel†) rightly yielded reverence to the See of Rome, for the purity of religion *there preserved* a long time without spot. The godly fathers of those times seeking to the Church of Rome, then for purity of religion most famous above all others.”

N.B.—No member of the Anglican Church can decline the authority of this extraordinary and unhappy man, of whose adventures and death you have an account in Smith's *Flores Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, and in Bishop Milner's *Reply to Grier*, pages 38, 39.

“The early fathers (says Dr. Fulke‡) do especially name the Church of Rome at that time.” N.B.—He means during the first six hundred years! Because as it was founded by the apostles, so it had continued in the doctrine of the apostles.

“St. Patrick had a special regard (says Usher§) for the Church of Rome, from whence he was sent for the conversion of this island, viz. Ireland! So had I lived in his days, I should as willingly have listened to the judgment of the Church of Rome as to the determination of any other church in the whole world, so reverend an estimation have I of the *integrity* of that church in those *good days*.”

This brings the purity, or if you will, the integrity, of the Roman Catholic Church to the close of the fifth century; for St. Patrick departed not this life (according to the Lanigan, tome I, p. 363) till A. D. 465. The grand question now arises: *When* did the Roman Church apostatize from the pure faith she professed during the first five hundred years, commit idolatry, and contract the *slough* of that slavish superstition charged upon her by Protestants? It is a very fair one. Observe the answers, and let the reader say whether he be one atom the wiser for them.

|| “It is very hard for *us* to answer at *what time* the Church of Rome fell into error, neither is it necessary to set down the time; all things were not overturned at once—the hairs of the head grow not grey at once,”—says one.

* Whitaker on Antichrist, p. 31.

† Jewel's Answer to Harding, p. 246.

‡ Fulke's Confutation of Purgatory, p. 379.

§ Usher's Religion of the ancient Irish, p. 87.

|| Whitaker's Answer to Campian's Reasons, p. 171.

* "We can neither tell by *whom*, nor at what time the enemy did sow your doctrine, nor do we know the *first author* of your Popish opinions,"—says another.

† "We do not hold (says Usher) that Rome was built in a day, or that the great *dunghill* of errors (a genteel phrase nearly allied to *slough*) we now behold in her was raised in *one* age. Neither can I *lay down* the time when she *first* thought herself wiser than her forefathers."

What kind of stuff is this? Suppose I were to say (pointing to any particular person) to Mr. Palmer,—I have known this man for these many years as a person strictly honest, and of most unblemished character; but he is now, I tell you, a false and deceitful fellow, and as such avoid him as much as possible. Why so! You knew him once, you say, to have been a person of probity and integrity, has he forfeited his fair fame by any notorious offences—such as murder, robbery, &c.—and where? You can inform me, I presume. Why no, indeed I cannot: all I say is, that he is *now* an infamous scoundrel; and if you will not believe me, I cannot help it. Now this is precisely the case between the Catholic Church and our modern sects who have dared to accuse her of errors, contracting slough, &c.; but once interrogate their doughty champions when she did so, why, indeed they know nothing of the matter!!!

Mr. Palmer may be *wiser* than his predecessors, let him then enlighten us, as I can assure him that we are as willing to pare off slough, and as unwilling to submit to *undue slavish* superstition as himself, or any member of the modern Church of England now in existence.

NOTE II.—*The acknowledged Purity of the Roman Catholic Church down to the present day.*

WE will first consult in this the Great Grand Sire of Protestancy, whose candour is very laudable.

† "In the Church of Rome are many excellent things, nay, every thing good in Christianity. For in the Church of Rome you have—reader, observe!—the true scriptures; true baptism; the true sacrament of the altar.

"The true keys for the remission of sin; the ten commandments; and all the sacraments; nay, I say more, that Popery is True Christianity, even the very *kernal* of Christianity." In possession of the kernal we shall never quarrel with Mr. Palmer for the *shell*! A very natural question arises here, viz.—If the Roman Church were, as he allowed, *True Christianity*, why did he desert her creed and communion?

The truth is, he *forgot* himself here as he did elsewhere, when in abolishing *private Mass*, he has madly owned *Satan himself* to have been his prime minister, instructor, and adviser.—See the 7th tome of his works, edition of Wittembergh, A. D. 1588, page 442, edition of Jena, tome 6, p. 28. This brings the purity of the Roman Church to the year 1536.

§ "Though I sincerely blame (says Prebendary Thorndyke) the imposing new articles on the faith of Christians, yet I must and do truly profess, that I find no position necessary to salvation prohibited, none destructive to salvation enjoined to be believed by the Church of Rome, and therefore, I must necessarily accept it for a true Church, as in the Church of England I have always known it accepted; seeing there can be no question made, but that it continueth the same visible body by the succession of Bishops and

* Powell on Papist's Supplications, p. 43.

† Usher's Answer to the Jesuit, p. 1.—The Jesuit's Reply, p. 2.

‡ Luther contra Anabaptistas, Tome 2.—German, p. 229.

§ Epilogue, p. 146.

laws that were first founded by the apostles. There remains therefore in the present Church of Rome, the profession of *all the faith necessary* for the salvation of all Christians to believe, either in point of *faith* or *manners*."

Thus this learned divine, in the 16th century, and that in a work written expressly in defence of the Church of England. In whose words, if Mr. Palmer can discover any *slough* or slavish superstition, he must be far more sharp sighted than the writer of these lines.

Let us now come to the 18th century, that is, so late as A. D. 1775, but sixty-six years ago!

"It must be acknowledged, (says the French Protestants in their memorial to the king,) that on comparing your Roman Church with ours, the grand points (notwithstanding some few abuses) are on *your side*, and to your advantage; you existed long before *we did*, descending in a direct line from the Apostles, whilst our Church is not as yet three hundred years old, it being an undeniable fact, that A. D. 1515, our ancestors did with yours communicate at the same Mass, celebrate the same Easter, and live in a perfect unity of religion; nay more! the chain of tradition, the first link of which St. Peter and St. Paul attached to the Church of Rome, has been so carefully preserved by you, that if the Holy Fathers Irenæus, Gregory, the Cyrils, Athanasius, and Chrysostome, were to revisit this world, they would acknowledge in the Church of Rome alone that communion of which they were themselves members on earth." Did those learned Protestants look on the Roman Church as one without a religion? Proh! pudor!

NOTE III.

1. God has a True Church in the World, or he has not. If not, then Christ left Man without a medium to Salvation; if he has, the Protestant is that True Church, or she is not, if not, then the Protestant is not the True Christian Church,—if she be, then the Protestant Church must have these following marks, viz.—Visibility, Unity, Universality, and Sanctity; which the Scriptures teach to be the Signs of Christ's Immaculate Spouse.

Visibility demonstrated to be a Mark of the True Church.

2. The House of our Lord shall be prepared on the top of Mountains, or it shall not. If it be, why then do Protestants deny that the Church may be always visible? If not, why then do they not deny that of Isaiah,—“The Mountain of the House of our Lord shall be prepared on the top of Mountains”?

3. A City seated on a Hill can either be hid, or not. If it can, why does our Saviour say, (St. Matt. v. 14,)—that a City seated on a Hill cannot be hid? If not, then the Church cannot be Invisible.

4. Christ either founded a Church on Earth that all nations may be edified therein, or he did not; If not, why do Protestants deny that of Isaiah,—“All Nations shall flow unto her”?—And again, (Psals.)—“All Nations whatsoever thou hast made, shall come and adore before thee”? If he did, why then do Protestants say, the Church may be invisible, since all Nations cannot be edified in a Church unseen?

5. A man for not hearing the Church is termed in Scripture an Heathen and a Publican, or not. If not, why then do not Protestants reform these words of St. Matthew, (xviii. 17,)—“He that will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as an Heathen and a Publican”? If he be, how then shall a man be termed an Heathen for not hearing a Church that was not visible, or yet extant in the world?

Unity demonstrated to be a Mark of the True Church.

6. A Natural Unity and connection of the Parts amongst themselves, and to the Head, is necessary for the conservation of the Natural Body, or not. If not, how can a natural Body subsist, if the parts be divided, and torn from one another, from the Head? If it be, why is that natural connection proper to a Natural Body, and not to a Spiritual Body?

7. Christ promised that there should be Unity in his Church, or he did not. If not, why do you not deny that of St. John, x. 16,—“And there shall be one Fold and one Pastor”? If he did, why do you deny Unity?

8. Unity is either requisite in God's Church, or not. If not, why do you not deny that of St. John, xvii. 11,—“That they may be one as we also are”? And again, 1 Cor. i. 10,—“I beseech you that you all speak one and the same thing, and that there be no Schism among you; but that you be perfect in the same mind, and in the same judgment”? If she be, why do Protestants deny the necessity of Unity?

9. Christ when he prayed, his prayer took effect, or it did not. If not, he in vain prayed that his Disciples should be one. If it did, then Christ's People are one.

Universality demonstrated to be a Mark of the True Church.

10. To be Universal, or co-existent with time and place, is a mark of the True Church, or it is not. If not, why does the Scripture say in St. Matt. xxviii. 19, 20,—“Go ye, teach all Nations,” &c.; and “Behold I am with you even to the consummation of the World”?—And again, Ephes. iv. 11, 12, 13,—“He gave some Apostles,” &c. “for the perfecting of the Saints”? If it be so, why do Protestants reject so evident a mark of the True Church?

11. The Church of God is either Universal, or co-existent with all time, or not. If not, why do you not deny that of St. John, xiv. 15, 16,—“Another Paraclete that he may abide with you for ever”?—And again, that of St. Luke, i. 32,—“He (Christ) shall reign in the House of Jacob for ever, and of his Kingdom there shall be no end”? If it be so, why do Protestants deny Universality?

12. Christ's Church is Universal, or co-existent with all place, or she is not. If not, how can that of the Prophet be true,—“Their sound went over all the Earth”?—or how can all Nations be taught? If it be true, why do Protestants deny Universality?

13. The Church of Christ either is Universal or Catholic, or she is not. If not, why do not Protestants deny the Apostles' Creed. If it be, why then do not they renounce Universality?

Sanctity demonstrated to be a Mark of the True Church.

14. The Church of Christ is eminent for Sanctity of Discipline and Doctrine, or she is not. If not, why do you not deny the Apostles' Creed, which says,—“I believe in the Holy Catholic Church”?—And again, Ephes. v. 26, 27,—“That he might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the Word of Life, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, nor any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish”? If the Church be so, why do Protestants deny Sanctity in the Church?

15. The Church of Christ is either Sanctified, or she is not. If not, why do not Protestants contradict St. Paul (1 Cor. vi. 11) when he says,—“And such some of you were; but you are washed, but you are sanctified, but you are justified, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit of our God”? If she be so, why do Protestants deny Sanctity in the Church?

16. The Church of Christ is proved to be Holy by the grace of Miracles, or she is not. If not, why did Christ say, in St. John, xiv. 12,—“He that believeth in me, the works that I do, he shall do also, and greater than these shall he do; because I go to the Father”? If it be so, why do Protestants sacrilegiously rob the Church of Sanctity, seeing that Christ granted her the grace of Miracles? Which I prove thus:

17. Christ either granted to True Believers the grace of casting out

Devils, and by the Imposition of Hands to cure the Sick, or he did not. If not, why do you believe the Scriptures, St. Mark, xvi. 17, 18,—“And these signs shall follow them that believe: in my name they shall cast out Devils; they shall speak with new Tongues; they shall take up Serpents; and if they shall drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay their hands upon the sick, and they shall recover”? If he did so, Protestants cannot deny the grace of Miracles in the Church.

18. The Protestant Church has the above-mentioned marks, or she has not. If not, then she is false. If she has, answer these queries?

19. Your Protestant Church, Rev. Sir, has been apparent and visible ever since Christ, or she has not. If not, then she is false. If she has, prove your lawful and uninterrupted Succession of Pastors, from the time of the Apostles, till Martin Luther and John Calvin.

20. Your Protestant Church either did appear before Luther and Calvin, or she did not. If not, then she is false. If she did, in what Kingdom or Nation was your doctrine preached, or by whom?

21. Martin Luther and John Calvin, were the first Founders of your Church, or they were not. If not, produce any that ever professed the same articles with you before them. If they were, then your Church is false.

22. Luther and Calvin either separated themselves from the world, or they did not. If not, who joined with them, or to whom did they adhere? If they did, then they departed from the visible Christian Religion.

23. Your Church either has Unity, or it has not. If not, then she is not the True Church of Christ. If she has, why are there so many Schisms and Sects among Protestants?

24. All your Reformers did either agree in Matters of Faith, or they did not. If not, then your pretended Reformation has no Unity. If they did, why do they so much differ in the most essential points? As I thus prove:

25. Luther and Calvin were true Reformers, or they were not. If they were, why did they differ in the most essential point of the Blessed Sacrament? and again in the Government of the Church?

26. All your Reformations either agree, or they do not. If not, then they are false, and void of the essential point, Unity. If they do, produce any two that agree in all points.

27. The Protestant Church is either Universal, or it is not. If not, then she is not the Catholic Church. If she be, shew me one of your preachers in Japonia, or even in the Kingdom of Spain.

28. The Protestant Church either has converted Nations, or she has not, If not, how can she be Universal? If she has, shew me even one Nation that she has converted.

29. The Protestant Church either has been Universal, or she has not. If not, then she cannot be the true Church. If she has, with what time has she been co-existent before Luther and Calvin?

30. The Protestant Church has been Universal in place, or she has not. If not, then she is not the true Church. If she has, in what place or station, I ask, did she appear before Luther and Calvin?

31. The Protestant Church has Sanctity, or she has not. If not, then she is not the Holy Catholic Church. If she has, shew me one of your Sect that ever was canonized.

32. Luther, Calvin, and the Reformers confirmed their Doctrine by Miracles, or they did not. If they did not, then they were not true Apostles. If they did, mention even one of the Miracles which they performed.

33. The signs which Christ said in Scripture followed your pretended Reformers, or they did not. If they did not, then they were not true Believers. If they did, shew one man they dispossessed, or one sick they restored to health.

34. Your Reformers were either famous for their virtuous lives, or they were not. If not, then they had not sanctity. If they were, why did they break their vows made to God, contrary to Scripture, and taught men so to do?

35. The Catholic Church in Communion with the See of Rome, and no other, stands firm and infallible against all the tempests of Apostacy, Heresy, and Schism; which I prove thus:

36. The Romans had once the True Church, or they had not. If not, then you must deny the words of Scripture, Rom. i. 8,—“First, I give thanks to my God, through Jesus Christ, for you all, because your faith is spoken of in the whole World.” And again, Rom. i. 7,—“To all that are at Rome, the beloved of God, called to be Saints, grace to you and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.” If they had, they retain the same Faith still infallibly, or they do not: if they do, then we agree; if not, they must have fallen from the True Faith, either by Apostacy, Heresy, or Schism.

37. The Ancient Apostolic Church in Communion with the See of Rome fell by Apostacy, or she did not. If not, then she is free from Apostacy. If she did, I must desire you to inform me when and where it was that she renounced the Holy Name of Jesus.

38. The Ancient Catholic Roman Church fell by Heresy, or she did not. If not, then she is free from all Heresy. If she did, I call on the Rev. William Palmer, to show me by what General Council she was condemned,—which of the Fathers ever wrote against her,—or by what authority was she otherwise reprov'd?

39. The Ancient Catholic Roman Church fell by Schism, and by dividing herself from some other Church, or she did not. If not, then she is not guilty of Schism. If she did, inform me from what Church did she separate,—from what body did she go forth,—where was the True Church which she forsook?

40. The True Holy Apostolic Catholic Church is Fallible, and can err, or she cannot. If not, why do Protestants falsely condemn her? If she be, how can that text of Scripture be true, 1 Tim. iii. 15,—“The House of God, which is the Church of the living God, the Pillar and Ground of Truth”?

41. The Church of God is Infallible in all her Proposals and Definitions of Faith, or she is not. If not, why should a man be esteemed an Heathen and a Publican for not hearing a false and an erroneous Church (St Matt. xvi. 19)? If she be, why do Protestants deny Infallibility?

42. Christ being the Head of the Church, and the Holy Ghost the Soul of the Church, guiding and directing the Church into all Truth, she can err, or she cannot. If not, then she is not Fallible. If she can, then Jesus Christ and the Holy Ghost guide her into error.—See St. John.

43. Christ is either a True Prophet, or he is not. If not, there is an end to Christian Faith. If he be, how can ever the Gates of Hell prevail against the Church, seeing that he prophesied, St. Matt. xvi. 18,—“The Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it”?

44. The Holy Ghost suggests all Truth to the Church, or he does not. If not, why do you believe that text of St. John, xiv. 16,—“And I will ask the Father, and he shall give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever”? If he does so, then he will suggest no errors, &c. Hence it is evident that the Spirit of Truth was not only promised to the Persons of the Apostles, but also to their Successors through all generations.

45. Christ was a wise man, or he was not. If wise, he did not build his house upon the sand, and make it subject to the infernal tempests. If not, why is he called the Wisdom of the Father?

46. A Congregation of People in despising Christ is guilty of Apostacy, or they are not. If not, you must give me a new definition of Apostacy. If they be, how can you clear yourselves of Apostacy in despising his Church, seeing it is said in Scripture, St. Luke, x. 16,—“He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me”?

47. Your Church (the Church of England) is guilty of Heresy, or she is not. If she be, &c. If not, how should the definition of Heresy agree with you, in adhering to so many private and singular opinions and errors of Faith, contrary to the general approved Doctrine of the Catholic Church?

48. Your Church is guilty of Schism, or she is not. If she be not, how should the definition of Schism agree with you in dividing yourselves from the body of all Faithful Christians, and in breaking off Communion with the Ancient Apostolic Catholic Roman Church?

49. That Church to which the above-mentioned Marks agree—viz. Apostacy, Heresy, and Schism—is a false Church, or she is not. If not, then you do not esteem Apostacy, Heresy, and Schism, to be marks of a False Church. If they be, then your Church (the Church of England, a Church by Law established, and consequently a mere creature of human invention) is false, erroneous, and is no Church.

50. All that which the Ancient Holy Catholic Roman Church holds as Articles of Faith, are Pious, Good, and Lawful; and which I will prove hereafter.

NOTE IV.

WHEN Muncer (*Sleidan*, L. 5, p. 49,) undertook of his own authority the functions of a Pastor, Luther decreed, "that no one should hear him, but that he should be asked, who sent you to preach, if he replied, that God sent him, tell him then, that he must prove it by a manifest miracle; for it is only by such signs that God declares his wish to make a change in the ordinary Form of the Mission." However, soon after this, Luther himself takes the Title of Pastor of Wittemberg, by the grace of God; and in his Letter to those Persons falsely calling themselves Bishops, (this is the manner he addresses the Bishops of the Catholic Church), he declares that this Title which he takes, grounds his right to it; and that he assumes it with the most complete contempt for them and for Satan. (*See Luth. Opera*, 2, fol. 305.) He further adds, that he gave himself that Title as a Proof of his Ministry that God had called him, and which he did not receive of men, nor by man, but by the Authority of God, and by the Revelation of Jesus Christ. In virtue of this Pretended Divine and Extraordinary Mission, he did as he pleased, he changed the ceremonies and usages of the Church; he being only a Priest, yet he presumed to consecrate Nicholas Amrsdorf, (but which was no consecration whatever,) Bishop of Nuremburg, and defended the validity of that consecration, having before ordained him Priest, he had constantly taught, since he separated from the See of Rome, that there was no occasion whatever to take up arms in defence of the Gospel, as he prophesied that before two years the Papacy would be destroyed. However in 1521, seeing that the wished for event did not take place, and that a powerful League was forming in Germany against him, he drew up an Address, and propagating it in all directions, he announced to the people, that notwithstanding his former opinion, yet he now thought that they should join together in these deplorable times, in defence of their Civil and Religious Rights; that they should arm and join together against all those who should wish to make war against them, even against the Emperor. (*See Sleidan*, L. 8, p. 117.) Giving way to his vindictive disposition, and laying aside all restraint, he blew the coals of Civil War by every means in his power, and excited the People "to wash their hands in the Blood of the Pope and of the Cardinals;" he distributed in all directions his Treasonable and Infuriated Denunciations against Prince George of Saxony, just at the moment when war was on the point of breaking out. (*Luth. Opera*, Tom. 1, fol. 199.)

From the foregoing, I draw the following conclusions: 1st, That Luther's Ministry was not from God; for if it were, he most undoubtedly would have proved it by Miracles, as our Saviour and the Apostles did theirs. 2nd, That this Doctrine is not that of Christ, for the Saviour of the world commands us to be obedient to those who are placed over us, and to render to Cæsar the things which are Cæsars, and to God the things which are God's; Luther's Doctrine is quite the reverse of this. 3rd, The Love of God, of our neighbour, and charity towards all men, are the Foundations of the Christian Religion; on the contrary, Luther advises the People "to wash their hands in the Blood of the Pope and of the Cardinals." He acknowledges that he abolished Private Masses by the advice of the Devil, with whom he was (as is acknowledged by himself) on the most intimate terms, he says, "Diabolus

multo frequentius, et propriis mihi in lecto accubare solit, quam mea Catherina.”—(*Idem in Calliquis Germanicis*, fol. 275, 281.) “The Devil,” said he, “sleeps oftener with me, and closer to my side, than my own Catherine.” In his famous Dispute with the Devil in regard of the Mass, Luther says, “I opposed to him the old Popish shield, viz., the Faith and Authority of the Church.” To which Satan replied, “Nonsense, shew me where it is written, (see how fond he is of the written word, or the Bible alone!) that a bad man can consecrate according to the Faith and intention of the Church! Where has God taught it?” To prove that the Church in communion with the See of Rome, and it alone is the True Catholic Church on Earth, I shall insist on the gift of Miracles. This was that Testimony which our Blessed Redeemer did himself produce, as his Letters of Credence, and both necessary and sufficient to prove his Mission: “If I had not (says our Lord) done among them the works that no other hath done, they would not have Sin; but now they have both seen and hated both me and my Father,” (St. John, xv. 24); viz., in not believing him to be the Messiah, God therefore has decreed it as a Law that “Whosoever refuses to believe and to submit to that Authority, to which he sets his hand and seal, by bestowing on it the gifts of Miracles, that Person commits sin.” The reason is given in the same text viz., because he thereby shews that he hates God, by not believing him. Now I insist, that the Church in communion with the See of Rome has done works and Miracles amongst us, such as no other Christian Church upon Earth has ever done, therefore, if we give credit to any other Church or Churches, and disbelieve or refuse to believe her, we shall commit sin, and shew ourselves to be haters of God. Now that the Church in communion with the See of Rome has done these Works or Miracles is so evident, both by the Testimonies of the Holy Fathers, and by the Authority of approved Historians, that those who deny it, must shew themselves either not to be men, or men who purposely shut their eyes to the known Truth. Yes, Heathens and Atheists will be as justifiable in their denial of the Miracles related in the old and new Testaments, as those will be who deny these. The Magdeburgences who were all professed and known Lutherans, do almost in every one of their centuries, recount multitudes of Miracles wrought by Persons whom they affirm to have been infected with what they call Popery, namely, by St. Bernard, St. Malachy, St. Dominick, St. Francis, and the like; as you may particularly see in Brerely, if you examine the several places to which his Index at the word Miracles will refer you, by which it will appear that most of those Miracles were done, not in confirmation of those Pious Articles of Faith which you hold with us, but even of those Points and Doctrines which Protestants call Popish Superstitions and Idolatries, such as the Sacrifice of the Mass, the respect and veneration which is given to Saints, Relics, Images, &c.

Certainly there are few Protestants among you but have heard and read how and in what manner the Christian Faith was first brought into England, amongst our Saxon ancestors; it was first preached by St. Augustin, of the Order of St. Bennet, and his fellow Monks, sent here by St. Gregory, the then Pope and Head of the Church in communion with the See of Rome, and it was exactly the same Faith that Catholics now teach, which was then confirmed by Wonderful Miracles from Heaven, as is proved by our own venerable Bede and others; yes even by your own Protestant Chronologers. Holinshead's Chronicle, the last Edition, vol. 1, book 5, c. 21, pp. 100, 102; Fox's Acts and Monuments, printed anno. 1576, p. 117; Stowe's Annals, printed anno. 1592, p. 66; Goodwin in his Catalogue of the Bishops of England, p. 4; see Fox also in the aforesaid Book at the word Miracles in the Index. To these I shall add the authorities of later Protestant writers, for the proof of undoubted Miracles wrought in their time, in a book entitled, History of the Kingdom of Congo in Africa, printed anno. 1597, published by Mr. Abraham Hartwell, Servant to the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, in which mention is made, L. 1, c. 1, of the Discovery of that Kingdom, anno. 1587, by Odoardo Lopez, and of its Conversion to the Christian Faith, L. 2, c. 2, and of the great and undoubted Miracles performed there by the Power of God, in the presence of the whole Army, L. 2, c. 3, in so much so, that the

said Hartwell, in his Epistle to the Reader, confesses that this Conversion of Congo was accomplished by Priests who said Mass, and after the Romish manner, and (says he) "This Action which tendeth to the Glory of God, shall it be concealed, and not committed to memory, because it was performed by Popish Priests, and Popish means? God forbid!" In like manner, Mr. John Pory, of Gonville, and of the University of Cambridge, in his *Geographical History of Africa*, published anno. 1600, pp. 410, 413, commends Mr. Hartwell for publishing the aforesaid Miracles, and acknowledges the same to be true. If any of my Readers should say, that this Testimony of Miracles is nothing to them, because they have never seen a Miracle, I reply, either they grant what these Authors report to be true, or they deny their Testimony, refusing to believe what they have not seen; if they grant the Truth of these Miracles, and yet remain out of the communion of the Holy Catholic Church, upon which God has conferred this gift, they have Sin, and hate God, according to the argument framed by our Lord himself, and which I have before mentioned. If they refuse to believe what they have not seen; first, they destroy Faith, which is an evidence of things not seen; secondly, they destroy all human conversation, no man must believe another; thirdly, they make it unjust in a Civil Magistrate to punish Rebels, Traitors, and Robbers, for where there is no Law, there can be no breach of a Law; and if no Law can be brought against a person who did not actually see the very Statute, which was passed in Parliament, and hear the Queen and both Houses of Parliament agree to it, (as in this case regarding Miracles), how could they with justice condemn and execute a Malefactor, who would urge at the Bar, that he never saw the Statute upon which he stands indicted, nor had any notice or knowledge thereof, otherwise than by hearsay and the report of Authors and Books, which since they are not sufficient Proofs of God's setting his Hand and Seal to a Law, by Miracles, he sees no reason why they should be Proofs for the Passing of that Statute, consequently as regards him, that Statute is not in force. What would the Rev. William Palmer's reply be to one who should give this for his plea against such an indictment. Suppose it referred to himself, as in the case of Miracles not seen by him, but substantiated on the very best authority. Lastly, this would excuse all Infidels since the days of the Apostles, and even those who lived in their times, in case they saw no Miracles. But some of my Readers may say with the learned Chillingworth: "That God in his justice may permit some true Miracles to be wrought to delude men who have forged many." To this I reply, that by thus arguing they would assist the Jews, who refused to believe the Doctrines of Christ and his Apostles notwithstanding their Miracles; for why may they not say, God in his justice for our sins, might permit these true Miracles to be wrought by Jesus and his Apostles, to delude us who have forged many? I hope this will satisfy any rational person, but if not, I have another answer to give him from Mr. Chillingworth's own words, p. 144, as follows: "It is impossible that God should lie, and that the Eternal Truth should set his hand and seal to the confirmation of a falsehood, or of such Doctrine as is partly true and partly false. The Apostles doctrine was thus (viz., by Miracles) confirmed, therefore it was entirely true, and in no particular false or uncertain." I may be told, that this contradicts Mr. Chillingworth's former position; I answer, that if Mr. Chillingworth be found to contradict himself, relying upon his own reason, it is not my fault, nor does it make anything against the Catholic Church. I shall here remark, that whenever in my works I speak of the Roman Church, I mean not the Church or Diocese of Rome simply by itself, and so pretend to make a particular Church to be an universal, and the universal Catholic Church of Christ. But, I mean by the Roman Church, all that vastly extended Community of Christians, who live in communion with, and in subjection and obedience to the Bishop of Rome, as their supreme Pastor and Governor on Earth in things appertaining to Faith next under Christ. This is the Flock of Christ, obeying the True Shepherd appointed by God to rule over them. I may be also asked, did the First Authors of the Pretended Reformation ever work Miracles? To this I reply, as for True Miracles I do not find they ever did; but something like Miracles, or rather

surprising Wonders, I find recorded by their own Writers, but the misfortune is, they are such as overthrow the whole Reformation if they were believed. Luther tells us in his book, *de Missa Angulari*, that what he wrote against the Mass was suggested to him by the Devil. This Book was printed and published by his own Reformed Doctors at Wittenberg; but because this now sounds scandalous to pious Reformed ears, it must therefore pass for an Imposture. Bolsec, a Protestant writer, tells us, that Calvin agreed to give a certain man named Bruleus, a sum of money, that he might come to raise him up from the Dead, and when all things were prepared for this farce, the new Apostle had no sooner commanded Bruleus (the supposed Dead Man) to rise, when his words had that strange efficacy as to strike him *Dead*. But his poor Wife, who lost both her husband and the hopes of her money, reviled the new Apostle, and discovered the imposture. But this is also offensive to the Reformation.

NOTE V.

THE Protestant Dr. Heylin (*Hist. of the Presbyterians*, p. 237, 238) informs us, that notwithstanding the boasted assistance of the Holy Ghost in the compiling of the Liturgy, Calvin dared to think otherwise of its regularity. In his Letter to Cranmer, he tells him, "That in the language of this Church (the Church of England) as it then stood, there remained a whole mass of Popery, which did not only blemish, but almost destroy God's public worship." Calvin wrote also a Letter to the Duke of Somerset, the Lord Protector, in which he dwells more particularly on the English Liturgy; in the Examining of which he argued against the Commemoration of the Dead, as also against Chrism and Extreme Unction, and then advises, "That all these Ceremonies should be abrogated."—*Hist. of the Presbyterians*, p. 72. Thus in the short reign of Edward the 6th, the Church of England, which till then had retained the Doctrine of the Real Presence, became gradually Calvinistical. A Second Edition of King Edward's Liturgy, or Common Prayer Book, embracing Calvin's sanguine injunctions, was published in the last year of his Reign, and this very Liturgy has been undergoing since that time, but more especially in Queen Elizabeth's Reign, many Reformations and Refinements.

I may be asked, how did the Bishops behave themselves in this change of Religion. You shall hear from the Protestant Dr. Heylin, p. 287, he says, "The Bishops at that time had been reduced into a narrower number than at any time before—and they being called in July—were required to take the oath of Supremacy—Kitching of Landaff only takes it, who having formerly submitted to every change, resolved to shew himself no changeling.—By all the rest it was refused, who were thereupon deprived of their several Bishoprics." Dr. Heylin, in p. 397, gives us to understand, though in quoting the words of Mr. Rastal, of what kind of people this new Clergy was made up, viz., of Coblers, Weavers, Tinkers, Tanners, Cardmakers, Tapsters, Fiddlers, Tailors, Bag-pipers, Alabasters, &c. &c.

I am continually told by esteemed Protestants, the great good which the Reformation has done to true Religion. I reply to this assertion, by laying before them the opinions of the most eminent Protestants on this very point, and which is another proof that God could have no hand, or give any assistance to this Pretended Reformation.

Andrew Dudith, in his Epistle to Beza's Theological Epistles, Ep. 1, writes as follows: "What sort of people are our Protestants, straggling to to and fro, and carried about with every Wind of Doctrine, sometimes to this side, and sometimes to that? You may perhaps know what their sentiments in matters of Religion are to day; but you can certainly never tell what they will be to-morrow. In what Article do these Churches agree among themselves, which have cast off the Bishop of Rome? Examine all from top to bottom, you shall scarce find one thing affirmed by one, which is not immediately condemned by another for wicked Doctrine." Permit me here to ask, can that Religion be true, whose Faith is as variable as the Wind that blows? surely not, for True Faith is as unchangeable as the Divinity. Piety

and Devotion gained no ground by the Pretended Reformation, since some of the best Protestant Preachers complain heavily of a sensible decay of Piety after the setting up of the New Religion, and fear not to say, that Men were much better when they were Papists. Luther in many places complains of the World's growing worse and worse. "And men," says he, "are now more revengeful, covetous, licentious, than they were even in the Papacy."—*Postil. Super. Evang. Dom. 1, Adv. and Dom. 26, post Trinit.* "Heretofore," says he, "when we were seduced by the Pope, every Man did willingly follow good works; and now no Man neither sayeth or knoweth anything, but how to get all to himself by exactions, pillage, theft, lying, usury, &c. &c."

Melancthon, on Matthew vi., says, "It is plain, that in those Countries, (he speaks of those Countries which first embraced Luther's Reformation,) mens whole concern is almost about Banqueting, Drunkenness, and Carousing; and so strangely barbarous is the People, that men are persuaded, that if they do but fast one day, they must die the following night."

Calvin, L. de Scandalis, says: "Of so many thousands, who renouncing Popery, seemed eagerly to embrace the Gospel, how few have amended their lives? Nay, what else did the greater part pretend to but by shaking off the yoke of Superstition, to give themselves more Liberty to follow all kind of Lasciviousness?"

Jacobus Andreas, on Luke xxi., says: "But no amendment of manners is found among them (Protestants); on the contrary, we see them lead an abominable voluptuous, beastly life; instead of Fasts, they spend whole nights and days in revelings and drunkenness."

Wolfgangus Musculus, in his Common-places, cap. de Decalogo, says: "Our Gospellers are grown so unlike themselves, that whereas under Popery they were religious in their errors and superstition; now in the light of the known truth, they are more prophane, light, vain, and temerarious than the very children of this World."—*Explanat. 3 Præcepti.* p. 85; Edit. 1560.

The like complaints are found in several other Protestant Authors. Such are the sad effects of your Pretended Reformation, as acknowledged by some of the most eminent Protestants. Mr. Bancroft (1, Dangerous Positions, 22) asserted that the Puritans of Scotland were denounced by his Majesty, to be unnatural subjects, seditious, troublesome, and unquiet spirits, members of Satan, enemies to the King and to the Commonwealth.

NOTE VII.

As the Church of England has followed closely the Doctrine of Calvin, I shall shew my readers the end Calvin came to, and written by two well-known Protestant Authors. God in his anger punished him severely before his death; he struck this wretched man with his powerful arm, that being in despair, and calling upon the Devil, he gave up his wicked soul, swearing, cursing, and blaspheming, eaten up by vermin and worms, having a most desperate ulcer in a particular part of his body, which decency forbids me to name, insomuchso that no one present could endure the stench. Calvin is accused by public Writers for gross Lasciviousness. for many abominable vices—and sodomitical lusts—for which last he was by the Magistrate (at Nayon) under whom he lived, branded on the shoulder with a burning iron; as we read in Schlusberg (Theolog. Calvinist, Lib. 2, fol. 72); the same is confirmed by Jo. Herennuis, (ii. de vita Calvini.)

The learned Julius Vindex says, in speaking of the Church of England, "Two things are certain, 1st, That during the reigns of Elizabeth, James 1st, and Charles 1st, she held the Doctrine of the Real Presence as firmly as the Church of Rome. 2ndly. That from that of Charles 2nd, she has become, in this point, quite Calvinistic." See Tillotson, Clarke, &c.

NOTE VIII.

THE Rev. William Palmer asserts in a Note in his last Reply to Bishop Wiseman, that my long Quotation from St. Augustine in my last Letter addressed to him on the Virgin Mary, is taken from spurious productions, and on which Quotation, he says, rests the whole strength of my cause. This is a blunder of his from beginning to end. 1st, The strength of my cause does not depend on that quotation. 2nd, The quotation is correct. It is not a continuous Quotation, but selected Paragraphs from that Sermon. St. August. Sermon 18, de Annunciatione Dominica. Fol. Edit. Basil. in off. Frobeniana, 1529.

